

CALT | Policy Statement #4

May 24, 2018 3-4:00 PM

CALT Participants: Mark Masteller, Luke Hopkins, Denise Michels, Reggie Joule, Meera Kohler

State Participants: Alice Edwards, Denise Koch,) Bob Gerlach (DEC – Office of the State Veterinarian), Heidi Hansen, Nikoosh Carlo, David Rogers, Janet Reiser, Katie Conway

Public Participants: Erin Dougherty Lynch (NARF), Mellisa Heflin (Bering Sea Elders)

Nils: Does anyone have thoughts about the policy statement?

We can move on to Goal 4.1, which relates back to ecosystem processes. Talks about the SOA reducing impacts to ecosystems. I might suggest that the goal references ways in which to do that so that it ties back better to the policy statement. The objectives go on to talk about food security, informed decision making, necessary research, and a One Health approach. Any thoughts on any of that?

Reggie Joule: Just wondering if anyone else feels that Goal 4.1 is a pretty large bite. My question is whether this is doable.

Nils: I mentioned policy statement #1 before. The adaptation and response measures there are more focused on community infrastructure. This goal is entirely focused on environment and ecosystems. This is the only part of the policy that addresses this component, which is a large bite.

Janet Reiser: I think that the objectives of the Goal 4.1 are about bringing in more Alaskan knowledge. Maybe the difficulty is in saying that the state will reduce the impacts. Maybe it's a disconnect between the goals and the objectives.

Nils: Maybe even “will use data to reduce impacts” isn't quite right. Maybe “using data science and various knowledge to understand those impacts and make decisions based on science” is better.

Luke Hopkins: I think that what you just said would be a much better approach to the wording in Goal 4.1.

Nils: Alice, are there things that jump out from a DEC perspective in terms of what we're already doing?

Alice Edwards: I had similar thoughts to what Janet said. I was struggling with the idea of “reducing impacts” because that's a big thing to take on and the objectives underneath it seem to be about looking at things from a One Health approach and looking more at food security and more about having the information and using it in a more holistic approach. I look at the second goal and you see a lot of the decision support piece is in 4.2, so I'm thinking about how those two goals are laid out next to each other. The first one seems to be more about assessment and the second one is about decision support. Dorothy or Bob may have more ideas too.

Hopkins: Going back to that policy statement. I hope that the language stays in there to implement actions. I don't want to lose the piece about implementing actions, whether they're legislative, financial, cooperating with other organizations. I don't want to lose that as we're talking about just collecting data.

Nils: I like what Alice said about these two goals with one following the other. We can collect data and conduct assessments, and then use that data to implement actions.

Joule: Is 4.1 the place where the use of science and indigenous knowledge would also help us to anticipate future climate change? The way I use this is that something's going to happen and we're going to assess it. Is there a way to work in here that we'll anticipate climate impacts so that it drives other actions in an effort to mitigate. We know that certain things are going to happen if there's less sea ice. Following that line, does that put us at an advantage where we may be able to anticipate certain kinds of future actions?

Nils: Under 4.2, we talk about developing effective actions for bridging science and indigenous knowledge. It seems that should have some intent behind it. Those things are generally good, especially in terms of decision support. I think that's a good idea that Reggie brings up to use it for decision support.

David Rogers: We're going to be looking at data gaps from a DF&G perspective. I think that there's value in anticipating future impacts. We permit on five-year horizons so it's hard to say how much it will help in that context. We take these changes into account every day. As we look at things, this is already going on.

Edwards: When we say "maintain food security", I wonder if there's a way to make that forward-looking. "Maintain" sounds like keeping a status quo rather than improving food security. Maybe there's some wordsmithing around that goal that could make it more forward-leaning in terms of what's to come.

Nils: I like improving rather than maintaining.

Joule: I think that DF&G does a good job on the management end and in utilizing local advisory boards as part of that change.

Mark Masteller: Goal 4.1 deals mostly with monitoring systems in general. 4.2 identifies data gaps in general. I would add a 4.3 that hints more at the implementation actions that could be done out there. A couple of those are already in there in a couple spots. I think that if you have 4.1 talking about benchmarking and monitoring, 4.2 talking about data gaps, and 4.3 talking about implementation, they would flow that way.

Nils: Let me ask this: the policy statement doesn't specifically call out the environment or ecosystem. I'm wondering if we also need a goal related to broader implementation of adaptation and mitigation actions beyond environmental or ecosystem considerations.

Hopkins: I think that your point is well-made, at least looking back at #1-5.

Masteller: Right now, it seems to me that 4.2 is just a mandate to the State of Alaska. As David pointed out, there are entities looking at this all the time. I don't necessarily think there needs to be a third goal, but we could interpret that implementation actions are part of the objectives, but it would be helpful to have a few more that are actions that need to be taken.

Hopkins: I think that we discussed earlier that several of these are action items. There may be something worth implementing. Adapt Alaska is looking at things that need to change.

Nils: Alice, what do you think about re-tooling this policy statement to focus on environment?

Edwards: I think that's not necessarily a bad idea. I think that the focus here seems to be on the environment.

Joule: I was reading in the USARC's email today about the new agreement and I thought that we more than likely might be able to tap into that information.

Hopkins: I wanted to go back to 4.1B. I'm wondering about "increasing or decreasing harvest planning based on ocean acidification", that "or" doesn't seem to belong in there.

Nils: In Fairbanks, we talked about response options in the environment. I think that there are ways maybe to increase or decrease acidity. Are there changes in the environment that we could make to mitigate impacts? I think that we're also looking at technological innovation, like using heat exchange near warmer water. Looking for new ideas. The wording in that "increasing or decreasing ocean acidity" might be too specific.

Hopkins: I think that the reports from the NOAA Fisheries Lab and others are incredibly open to discussion. Maybe it's just changing the wording in there.

Nils: There's a large portion of geoengineering in that phrase that might be worrisome to people. Any other comments on what's in here right now?

Nils: I'll send this to the Science Advisory Panel and to DF&G and DEC. Generally what we've done with the other policy statement groups is to give the group a couple weeks to mull over what's changed and add additional edits.

Next meeting: 2pm on the 7th.